REMARKS

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent in-person interview. The claim amendments and arguments submitted in this paper are consistent with the amendments and arguments presented during the course of the interview. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-24, 26-33 and 38-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Natarajan et al. (U.S. Pat. No.6,973,034), hereinafter *Natarajan*.[1]

By this amendment claims 1, 9, 19, 29-32 and 38 have been amended.[2] No claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-24, 26-33 and 38-40 are pending, of which claims 1, 19, 29, 32 and 38 are the only independent claims at issue.

As discussed during the interview, the present invention is generally directed to facilitating a performance enhancement in message-based computing. For example, claim 1 defines a performance-based event transmission interface across which a request from a source is transmitted to a destination and a filter component in communication with the destination that dynamically determines which response information is relevant in order to filter out any excess response information that is deemed irrelevant, such that only relevant responses from the destination are transmitted to the source via the event transmission interface, wherein the filter component is part of at least one of native code and managed code and wherein irrelevant responses are discarded, wherein the source notifies a native layer that an event handler has attached or detached.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 Rejections

As discussed during the interview, *Natarajan* describes a technique for collecting operating information from network elements and for controlling network element behavior in a feedback-based adaptive data network (Title). *Natarajan*'s feedback-based adaptive network updates network control information based on network element reports that are sent to a

---

[1] Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

[2] Support for the amendments to the claims is found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to paragraphs [0007], [0037], [0041], [0048] and Figures 1-6.

centralized data store (Abs.). *Natarajan* also describes an event notification service where "at least a portion of the network elements include an associated event handling entity or event handler which communicates with [the] event server," (Col. 21:22-25). The event handler enables its host device to receive event notification messages relating to the occurrence of one or more events for which the host device has registered to receive notification (Col. 21:30-33).

However, while *Natarajan* describes an event notification service that sends event notification messages to registered devices, *Natarajan* does not mention determining whether response information is relevant or irrelevant. Moreoover, *Natarajan* does not mention determining whether response information is relevant or irrelevant in order to filter out any excess response information that is deemed irrelevant. Furthermore, *Natarajan* does not mention that only relevant responses from a destination are transmitted to a source via an event transmission interface. *Natarajan* also fails to mention discarding irrelevant responses.

Accordingly, *Natarajan* fails to teach or suggest "a filter component in communication with the destination that dynamically determines which response information is irrelevant in order to filter out any excess response information that is deemed irrelevant, such that only relevant responses from the destination are transmitted to the source via the event transmission interface, wherein the filter component is part of at least one of native code and managed code and wherein irrelevant responses are discarded," as recited in combination with the other limitations of claim 1.

Accordingly, at least for the reasons outlined above, claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for any of these reasons, claims 19, 29, 32 and 38 also patentably define over the art of record. Since each of the dependent claims depend from one of claims 1, 19, 29, 32 and 38, each of the dependent claims also patentably define over the art of record for at least either of the same reasons.

35 U.S.C. 101 Rejections

Claims 9, 29, 31, 38 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for reciting non-statutory subject matter. Claims 9 and 29-31 have been amended to recite a computer-readable storage medium. Claim 38 has been amended to include a processor and system memory. Applicants submit that this language causes claims 9, 29, 31, 38 and 39 to recite tangible embodiments. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claims 9, 29, 31, 38 and 39 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 12th day of August, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

/GREGORY R. LUNT/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
GREGORY R. LUNT
Registration No. 57,354
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

2439804_1.DOC